

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

DAMION D. FLOWERS,

§

Plaintiff,

§

V.

§

No. 3:19-cv-2052-K-BN

PRECISE AUTO REPAIR.,

§

Defendant.

§

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Damion D. Flowers, a resident of Irving, Texas, filed a *pro se* Complaint for Civil Case Alleging Negligence against Precise Auto Repair and/or G.M. Eric. *See* Dkt. No. 3. Flowers's lawsuit has been referred to the undersigned United States magistrate judge for pretrial management under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and a standing order of reference from United States District Judge Ed Kinkeade.

On August 29, 2019, the Court ordered Flowers to file no later than September 20, 2019 a written response to show the Court that it has subject matter jurisdiction over this lawsuit. *See* Dkt. No. 5. He filed both an amended complaint [Dkt. No. 6] and a timely response [Dkt. No. 7].

The undersigned now enters these findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation that the Court should dismiss this action without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

**Applicable Background, Legal Standards, and Analysis**

Federal courts have an independent duty to examine their own subject matter

jurisdiction, *see Ruhrgas AG v. Marathon Oil Co.*, 526 U.S. 574, 583-84 (1999), particularly where – as is the case here – a plaintiff's complaint fails to make it apparent that subject matter jurisdiction exists.

The federal courts' jurisdiction is limited, and federal courts generally may only hear a case if it involves a question of federal law or where diversity of citizenship exists between the parties. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332. Because Flowers chose to file his lawsuit in federal court, it is his burden to establish federal jurisdiction. *See Butler v. Dallas Area Rapid Transit*, 762 F. App'x 193, 194 (5th Cir. 2019) (per curiam) (“[A]ssertions [that] are conclusory [ ] are insufficient to support [an] attempt to establish subject-matter jurisdiction.” (citing *Evans v. Dillard Univ.*, 672 F. App'x 505, 505-06 (5th Cir. 2017) (per curiam); *Jeanmarie v. United States*, 242 F.3d 600, 602 (5th Cir. 2001))). And if he does not, this lawsuit must be dismissed. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 12(h)(3) (“If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action.”).

In diversity cases, each plaintiff's citizenship must be diverse from each defendant's citizenship, and the amount in controversy must exceed \$75,000. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(a), (b).

Federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 “exists when ‘a well-pleaded complaint establishes either that federal law creates the cause of action or that the plaintiff's right to relief necessarily depends on resolution of a substantial question of federal law.’” *Borden v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 589 F.3d 168, 172 (5th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Franchise Tax Bd. v. Constr. Laborers Vacation Tr.*, 463 U.S. 1, 27-28 (1983)).

“A federal question exists ‘if there appears on the face of the complaint some substantial, disputed question of federal law.’” *In re Hot-Hed Inc.*, 477 F.3d 320, 323 (5th Cir. 2007) (quoting *Carpenter v. Wichita Falls Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 44 F.3d 362, 366 (5th Cir. 1995)).

The Court will not assume it has jurisdiction. Rather, “the basis upon which jurisdiction depends must be alleged affirmatively and distinctly and cannot be established argumentatively or by mere inference.” *Getty Oil Corp. v. Ins. Co. of N.A.*, 841 F.2d 1254, 1259 (5th Cir. 1988) (citing *Ill. Cent. Gulf R. Co. v. Pargas, Inc.*, 706 F.2d 633, 636 & n.2 (5th Cir. 1983)).

First, even though the original complaint Flowers submitted – filed on a form – explicitly states that jurisdiction is based on diversity, his factual allegations do not bear that out, as Flowers lists an address in Arlington, Texas for the only defendant he has sued. *See* Dkt. No. 3 at 2. And, to the extent that Flowers bases jurisdiction on a federal question, *see id.* at 6 (checking the box next to “440 Other Civil Rights”), no facts in that complaint plausibly allege a violation of federal law, *see, e.g., Mitchell v. Clinkscales*, 253 F. App’x 339, 340 (5th Cir. 2007) (per curiam) (“The complaint contains no allegation that Mitchell and Clinkscales are citizens of different states; thus, Mitchell failed to plead and establish subject-matter jurisdiction based on the existence of complete diversity. Additionally, although Mitchell argues that Clinkscales is liable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Mitchell does not allege facts demonstrating that Clinkscales acted under color of state law; thus, Mitchell failed to plead and establish subject-matter jurisdiction based on the existence of a federal question. [And t]he

district court was required to dismiss the complaint.” (citations omitted)).

The amended complaint, similar to the original complaint, is styled as a “complaint for a civil case alleging negligence,” and no facts alleged therein support a basis for either diversity or federal question jurisdiction. Dkt. No. 6. And Flowers’s response to the show cause order – titled a complaint – fails to address subject matter jurisdiction at all. *See* Dkt. No. 7.

The Court should therefore dismiss this action without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

### **Recommendation**

The Court should dismiss this action without prejudice under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(h)(3).

A copy of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge’s findings, conclusions, and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or

adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).

DATED: September 24, 2019



---

DAVID L. HORAN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE